

PANKAJ TANDON
(BOSTON UNIVERSITY)

THE LOCATION AND KINGS OF PĀRADĀN *

SUMMARY

Scholars have been unsure of the location of the kingdom of Pāradān, mentioned in the ŠKZ inscription of the Sasanian emperor Shāpur I (241-272) and the Paikuli inscription of Narseh (293-303). Most estimates placed it in what is now the western part of the Pakistani state of Balochistan and eastern Iran, west of the estimated location of the kingdom of Turān. This paper provides new numismatic evidence, linked to earlier archaeological evidence, that allows us to confidently place Pāradān in the eastern part of Balochistan, most probably east of the kingdom of Turān. The coin series, issued over a period of about 175 years, shows no Sasanian influence and therefore sheds light on the relationship between the centre and the periphery in the Sasanian empire.

Keywords: dynastic history; numismatics; Pāradān (Pārdān/Paradene); ŠKZ; Paikuli; Sasanian provinces.

RÉSUMÉ

La localisation du royaume de Pāradān, cité dans l'inscription de la ŠKZ de l'empereur sassanide Shāpur I^{er} (241-272) et dans l'inscription de Paikuli du roi Narseh (293-303), est depuis longtemps débattue par les chercheurs. On a le plus souvent proposé de le situer dans la partie occidentale du Balouchistan pakistanais et en Iran oriental, à l'ouest de la localisation supposée du royaume de Turān. Le présent article fournit de nouveaux matériaux numismatiques qui, en appui des matériaux archéologiques déjà connus, nous permettent avec certitude de situer le Pāradān dans la partie orientale du Balouchistan, et très probablement à l'est du royaume de Turān. La série des monnaies, émises sur une période de 175 ans environ, montre l'absence d'influence sassanide et, par là même, éclaire la question des relations entre le centre et la périphérie de l'empire sassanide.

Mots clés : histoire dynastique ; numismatique ; Pāradān (Pārdān/Paradene) ; ŠKZ ; Paikuli ; provinces sassanides.

* I owe a debt of thanks to several individuals for helpful discussions and email exchanges on the subject of the Pāratārājas over the years: Shailen Bhandare, Joe Cribb, Harry Falk, Tom Mallon, Bob Senior and Nicholas Sims-Williams. I also wish to acknowledge the help of Touraj Daryaei, Richard Frye, and especially Frantz Grenet and Agnes Korn for their detailed comments, and to thank Wilfried Pieper, Bob Senior and Anne van't Haaff for permission to publish coins from their collections.

Since early in the 20th century, scholars of Sasanian history have been attempting to determine the location of the kingdom of Pāradān (Pārdān or Paradene), mentioned in inscriptions of Shāpur I (r. 241-272) and Narseh (r. 293-303). Herzfeld 1924,¹ following Smith 1897,² had surmised that it was located in the Surat district north of Bombay. Brunner 1983 concluded that it consisted of the “interior hill ranges of Gedrosia and the intervening basin of the Mashkel.”³ In 1963, noting that “we have no literary references to it and cannot locate it,” Frye suggested “that it may be located in Arachosia or at the mouth of the Indus river rather than a small locality in Gedrosia.”⁴ Later (1984), he had modified his assessment to say: “Paradene may be the land around present Quetta, although possibly including Qandahar, but this is quite uncertain.”⁵ Mukherjee (1972) thought it might be in the Jhelum district. Chaumont (1975), while acknowledging that her choice “bien qu’à peu près établie,” placed it in the area of modern-day Bampur in Iranian Balochistan.⁶ Gyselen (1989), speaking of Turgistān, Makurān and Pārdān, acknowledged that “La glyptique ne nous a rien transmis pour ces régions situées au sud et sud-est du Sakastān,” but also placed Pārdān on her map roughly in the area of today’s Iran-Pakistan border.⁷ Kettenhofen (1995), likewise, conceded that “Die genauen Grenzen von Pāradān sind nicht exakt festlegbar,”⁸ but also positioned it in the same general area as Gyselen.⁹ Huyse (1999) acknowledged that “Die genaue Lage des kleinen Par(a)dān ... ist umstritten und nicht genau festzulegen,” but situated it on his map in the same place as did Brunner and most of the others.¹⁰

In all these cases, the writers had to try to guess the location of Pāradān because of the lack of any solid evidence, literary or archaeological. Although there seemed to be somewhat of a consensus that the best guess for Pāradān’s location was between Seistan in the west and Turān to the east, no one had any real confidence in this estimate. As Frye had indicated in 1963, “One must admit the evidence is not encouraging for any proper identification.”¹¹

¹ Herzfeld 1924, p. 230.

² Smith 1897, p. 899. Smith had incorrectly associated the Pārada tribe with the Pārādā river mentioned in an inscription found in Nasik (see his n. 2).

³ Brunner 1983, p. 776.

⁴ Frye 1963, p. 205.

⁵ Frye 1984, p. 298.

⁶ Chaumont 1975, p. 137.

⁷ Gyselen 1989, p. 87.

⁸ Kettenhofen 1995, p. 10.

⁹ See the map in Kettenhofen 1995, p. 173.

¹⁰ Huyse 1999, II, p. 31 and Tafel 2 (map).

¹¹ Frye 1963, p. 274 (n. 19). Frye reiterated this general conclusion in a private exchange I had with him in April 2010, indicating that there had been no progress in determining the location of Pāradān.

The purpose of this paper is to provide new evidence that finally dispels this discouraging uncertainty and resolves the issue of the location of Pāradān. I will show that we may definitively place Pāradān in the north-eastern part of what is now the Pakistani province of Balochistan, perhaps extending into southern Afghanistan and maybe even to western Pakistani Balochistan. This reverses the implicit consensus, albeit a tentative one, that placed it further west. The evidence consists primarily of a coin series in which the issuers refer to themselves as Pāratarājas or Pāradarājas (kings of the Pāratas or Pāradas). These coins are reportedly found mostly in the area around the town of Loralai in north-east Balochistan, although some reports also indicate their appearance in Zhob, Quetta, Chaman, Kandahar and a vague “desert area on the Pakistan-Iran border.” Although these kinds of unsubstantiated reports are less than the solid evidence we would like, the reports for the finds around Loralai, coming repeatedly from several independent sources, are very strong and are buttressed by an archaeological find made in 1926-27 by Sir Aurel Stein which can be linked to the coins.

Not only does the numismatic evidence help us locate the kingdom of Pāradān, it also gives us some detailed information about the ruling dynasty. The coins reveal the names of fifteen individuals, all but two of them bearing Iranian names, and eleven of whom are known to have issued coins. I estimate the dates of the coins to be in the second and third centuries—*circa* 125-300 CE, possibly slightly later—and this also allows us to tentatively identify the kings who were in power at the time of the Shāpur I and Narseh inscriptions. Thus they allow us a substantial window into the Pārada or Pārata tribe and therefore to begin to place this dynasty into its proper place in Iranian history.

In particular, improved knowledge of this dynasty sheds light on the nature of the administration of the Sasanian empire. Although Shāpur I had mentioned Pāradān as one of the lands in his dominion, the fact that the kings of Pāradān retained their right to issue their own coinage is significant. It indicates that Pāradān was not a province of the Sasanian state in the usual sense of the term, but at best a vassal state that presumably retained considerable independence. Indeed, the coin evidence raises the possibility that Pāradān may never have really been a province of the Sasanian empire at all.

Identification of this dynasty and the general area of its rule also fills a gap in our knowledge of the history of Balochistan. At present, we know essentially nothing about this history between the time when Alexander’s troops passed through in 326 BCE and the arrival of Islam in the 7th century. Learning the identity of a major dynasty that ruled in Balochistan

for some 175 years, and perhaps longer, helps to partially fill this yawning gap of close to 1,000 years.

INSCRIPTIONAL EVIDENCE

In his inscription at Ka'ba-i Zardušt (ŠKZ), the Sasanian emperor Šāpur I listed Pāradān (Pārdān or Paradene) as one of the provinces of his empire:

§1. Ich, der Mazdā-verehrende 'Gott' Šābuhr, der König der Könige von Ērān und Nicht-Ērān, ... bin Herr von Ērānšahr,

§2. und besitze die Länder Persis, Parthien, Xūzestān, Mēšān, Asūrestān, Nōdšīragān (=Adiabene), Arbāyestān, Aserbeidschan, Armenien, Wiruzān (=Iberien), Sīgān, Albanien, Balāsagān, bis hin zum Kaukasus und (zum) Alanen-Tor, und die ganze Elburzkette,

§3. Medien, Gurgān (=Hyrkanien), Marw, Harēw, und ganz Abaršahr, Kirmān, Sagestān, Tūrān, Makrān, Pārdān, Hindestān, Kušānšahr bis vor Pešāwar (?) und bis nach Kāšyar (?), Sogdien und Taškent, und von jenseits des Meeres das Land Mazūn (=Oman).¹²

In his Paikuli inscription, the emperor Narseh lists the King of Pāradān as one of the notables who were in gratitude and friendship with him upon his victory over Varahran III:

And Caesar and the Romans were in gratitude (?) and peace and friendship with me. And the King of Kušān, [and ...] Aspny(?), and the King of Xwārizm, and D/Zāmadīg[ut?] the [...] bed of Kwšd'n ... and Pgrymbk [...], and Sēd(?) the Šyk'n of Harēw, and Pāk Mehmān, and Birwān Spandwardān, and the King of Pāradān, and King Rāzgurd, and King Pndplnk, and the King of Makurān, and the King of Tūrān, [and] the King [...], and] the King of Gur[gān][Balāsa]gān, and the King of Mskyt'n, and the King of Iberia, and the King of Sīgān, and King Tirdād, and Amru King of the Lahmids, and Amru [King of] the Abgars(?), ...¹³

The questions raised by these inscriptions related to our subject are: Where was the Kingdom of Pāradān and who were its kings? These are the questions addressed in this paper.

In the absence of any specific information on the location of Pāradān, it would be natural to look at the position of that kingdom in the inscription lists vis-à-vis other kingdoms whose location is known. The Paikuli inscription is not very helpful in this regard, as the King of Pāradān is mentioned in the midst of other names and places that we cannot locate

¹² Huyse 1999, I, pp. 22-24, the translation based on the Middle-Persian inscription.

¹³ Humbach and Skjærvø 1983, Part 3.1.

definitively: Birwān Spandwardān, and King Rāzgurd, and King Pndplnk. But the ŠKZ inscription seems to follow a general pattern of naming the provinces roughly from west to east in a logical geographic order. The provinces of Kerman and Seistan are listed together before Pāradān is mentioned; we know that they are located in what is now eastern Iran, and that would imply that Pāradān is further east. Further, Hindestān, which is also further east, is mentioned later than Pāradān and is quite clearly intended to refer to the Indus valley, perhaps including parts of modern-day Sindh and even southern Punjab. Since Pāradān is listed before Hindestān, it must be west of the Indus valley. There are in fact three kingdoms mentioned in between the two “bookends” (Seistān and Hindustān), namely Turān, Makurān and Pāradān, in that order. All these three kingdoms must lie therefore in the general area of modern-day Balochistan. The question is, can we narrow down their respective locations?

Although they do not say so explicitly, this appears to be the approach taken by most authors.¹⁴ The location of Makurān, taken to be the Makran coastal plain, has seemed fairly certain. That leaves Turān and Pāradān. Both Brunner and Frye attempted to locate Turān first. In his initial attempt in 1963, Frye asserted that “Turān probably include[ed] most of the province of Kalat in present-day Pakistan.”¹⁵ And he maintained this same stance in 1984 when he stated: “Turān is probably the same as Medieval Turān with its center in the Kalat area of Baluchistan.”¹⁶ Brunner was on the same general wave-length: “The kingdom of Turān ... probably extended from the Bolan pass through the Budahah district and the Pab and Kirthar ranges to a vague border with Makran and Hind near Daibul. From Kizkanan (Kalat) in the tribal country, it extended as far as the Hind plain.”¹⁷

That left Pāradān to be squeezed in between the “known” or assigned countries. In his 1963 version, as we have seen, Frye suggested Arachosia (north of Turān) or an area near the mouth of the Indus (east of Turān). In the 1984 version, he placed Pāradān possibly in the Quetta area, just north of Turān in quite a circumscribed space. Brunner, on the other hand, placed Pāradān to the west of Turān, in the “interior hill ranges of Gedrosia and the intervening basin of the Mashkel.” This would correspond to the area around the modern-day district of Kharan in western Pakistani Balochistan.

Brunner does not explain his decision on the location of Pāradān and it is in fact somewhat inexplicable, since it places Pāradān in between Seistan

¹⁴ Smith’s and Herzfeld’s theory of placing Pāradān in the Surat district has never gained much acceptance and is not considered here.

¹⁵ Frye 1963, pp. 204-205.

¹⁶ Frye 1984, p. 298.

¹⁷ Brunner 1983, p. 775.

and Turān, even though those two countries are listed one after the other in the ŠKZ list. If one accepts the general notion of the ŠKZ list being presented in some sort of logical geographic order, then the list of “Kirmān, Sagestān, Tūrān, Makrān, Pārdān, Hindestān” would suggest that Turān would be contiguous with Seistan (and hence just east of it) and that Pārdān would be further to the east.¹⁸ Frye avoids this issue by placing Pārdān north of Turān, but he creates a new problem for the contiguity principle: now Pārdān is not contiguous with Makurān, even though they are adjacent on Shāpur I’s province-list.

Other authors have agreed with Brunner’s general solution. Chaumont, Gyselen, Kettenhofen and Huyse all place Pārdān to the west of Turān. Chaumont has it all the way in Iranian Balochistan around modern Bampur, while others place it more generally in the area of today’s Iran-Pakistan border, or in western Pakistani Balochistan. No one provides very clear reasons for their choice. Chaumont seems to be strongly influenced by Ptolemy’s assertion that Paradene occupied the interior of Gedrosia and her assumption that the ancient city of Pura (modern Bampur), which had been a major metropolis in the time of Alexander, must have been the center of the area to which Ptolemy was referring. Others do not discuss their decision on why Pārdān should be west of Turān. In most cases, authors simply note that it is difficult to know where Pārdān is and then place it to the west of Turān on their maps.

I would suggest that the logical solution to this conundrum is to locate Turān, not Pārdān, to the immediate east of Kirman and Seistan, with Pārdān further to the east and Makran running south of both Turān and Pārdān, thereby being contiguous to both. The province-list of “Kerman, Seistan, Turān, Makurān, Paradene, Hindustan” would then satisfy a principle of geographic contiguity that each kingdom is contiguous to each of the kingdoms named before and after it in Shāpur’s list. Turān could be located quite far to the west, roughly in the area of today’s Iran-Pakistan border or perhaps including much of the western part of today’s Pakistani Balochistan. Or it could stretch a little further to the east and include the area around Kalat. Although neither Frye nor Brunner says so explicitly, their reason to locate Turān in the Kalat area was presumably the identification of Turān with Qusdar (just south of modern Kalat) in the medieval text the *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam*.¹⁹ If this identification is correct, it would force

¹⁸ Indeed, Brunner himself suggests such a notion of implied geographic contiguity when he says that the listing of Kushanshahr immediately after Hind in “Shapur I’s province-list seems to imply actual contact between the provinces Hind and Kushanshahr” (see Brunner 1983, p. 776). But he fails to use the same principle when assigning the location of Pārdān.

¹⁹ Minorsky 1970, p. 123.

Pāradān into a smaller area further east. Pāradān could be located in the area around Loralai, perhaps extending as far west as Quetta and even Kandahar, and extending north-east towards Zhob and even towards the Indus river.²⁰ This would be a large area, would be consistent with the coin evidence and also would seem logically plausible given Shāpur I's list. It would also correspond somewhat to Frye's 1984 suggestion. But the identification of Turān with Qusdar may not be accurate for the early Sasanian period in any case. The *Hudūd al-ʿĀlam* was written only in the late 10th century and it is quite possible that the tribes inhabiting Turān in the 2nd and 3rd centuries were driven further east over the next five or six centuries. Thus it seems quite plausible also to locate Turān in the area of eastern Iranian Balochistan and western Pakistani Balochistan and for Pāradān to stretch somewhat towards the Iran border.

What is most important is the conclusion that Pāradān was located east of Turān, reversing the view of many previous authors. This is, I believe, most consistent with the evidence of the Sasanian inscriptions and is precisely what the archaeological and numismatic evidence reveals as well.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

In the winter of 1926-27, Sir Aurel Stein discovered about fifty pottery fragments with inked lettering in the course of excavating the ruins of a Buddhist site at Tor Dherai in the Loralai district of Balochistan.²¹ Five of the potsherds carried Brāhmī letters, while the remainder had Kharoshthī letters on them. Although Stein did not publish anything about these finds, Sten Konow did, after he examined the fragments. He was unable to make any meaningful legend from the Brāhmī finds, but constructed what appeared to be a dedicatory inscription by combining many of the Kharoshthī shards together. Konow's reconstruction reads:

Of the Shahi Yola Mira, the master of the vihara, this water hall (is) the religious gift, in his own Yola-Mira-shahi-Vihara, to the order of the four quarters, in the acceptance of the Sarvastivadin teachers. And from this right donation may there be in future a share for (his) mother and father, in future a share for all beings and long life for the master of the law.²²

In commenting on the inscription, Konow stated: "The name Yola-Mira is not known to us," and was therefore unable to deduce anything

²⁰ According to Mukherjee 1972, p. 50, Ptolemy mentions a town called Paradabathra on the banks of the river Indus (Ptolemy, *Geography*, VII, 1, 58). Judging by the name, this may well have been a city in Pāradān.

²¹ Stein did not publish this find, which was published later by Konow; see below.

²² Konow 1929, pp. 173-176.

substantive from the find. However, as I will detail in the next section, we now know ²³ that Yolamira was the name of a Pārata king, the first to issue coins as far as we know, and dated to c. 125-150 CE. Further, Yolamira's coins are reportedly found in the Loralai area, as were the pottery shards, thereby suggesting that the Yolamira of the coins is none other than the Yolamira of the potsherd dedication.

Stein's potsherds therefore give us tangible evidence that the Pārata kings held sway in the Loralai district in the first half of the 2nd century. They give credence to the informal reports that the coins associated with this dynasty are found in this area with some frequency. And since the coin sequence seems to last approximately 175 years (see next section for more details), this suggests that the kings of Pāradān ruled in at least this area during the period c. 125-300, a period which includes the dates for the ŚKZ and Paikuli inscriptions.

There is one other piece of archaeological evidence possibly relevant to our subject and turned up by Sir Aurel Stein, although it is of an informal nature. During the course of his archaeological research in Balochistan, Stein came across three stone embankments near the oasis town of Panjgur "constructed of large unhewn stones ... manifestly intended to secure flood water for level areas ..."²⁴ The importance of these embankments for our purposes is that Stein reports they were known to the locals as "Pardān-damb." Now "Pardān" is probably not related to "Pārdān," so connecting these embankments to the Pāradas is tenuous at best, but they could be a hint of ancient irrigation works constructed by the Kings of Pāradān, and they suggest at least a remote possibility that the ancient kingdom was not confined to the Loralai area but may have extended a considerable distance westward; Panjgur is approximately 375 miles south-west of Loralai. This would be consistent with the reports of Pāratarāja coin finds in the desert area near the Pakistan-Iran border.

NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE

I turn now to the numismatic evidence on the Pāratarājas or kings of Pāradān. Before diving into the details, it is worth noting that I am taking for granted that the names Pārata and Pārada are interchangeable and stand for the same people. Mukherjee (1972) had proposed this identity many years ago in his monograph on the tribe. Falk (2007) has shown recently that both terms appear in the Indian sources, where either one or the other name (but never both together) appears in the standard lists of tribes from north-western India, although the Pārada spelling seems more common.

²³ See Tandon 2006.

²⁴ Stein 1931, p. 45.

The facts that the two spellings are never seen together in the same list, but that each is always in association with the same other north-western tribes such as the Yavanas, the Pahlavas, the Sakas and the Kambojas, suggest that they are in fact alternative spellings of the same name. In any case, any possible ambiguity now has a complete resolution, as I have discovered some very late coins of the series where the name of the dynasty is spelled Pārada rather than the usual spelling Pārata used through the entire rest of the series.²⁵

I have been studying the coins of this dynasty for about the last ten years and have published my findings in three recent papers.²⁶ Almost all the coins carry a bust on the obverse and a swastika surrounded by a circular legend on the reverse.²⁷ The language of virtually all the coin-legends is Prakrit,²⁸ and the legends themselves are written sometimes in Brāhmī letters and sometimes in Kharoshthī, recalling the similar pattern of the potsherds discovered in Loralai by Stein. Finally, the coins are found in silver and copper, but there is almost no overlap between them; kings who issued coins in silver issued no copper coins, and kings who issued copper coins issued no silver. The one exception seems to be the king during whose reign the transition from silver to copper took place. A further regularity is that almost all the silver coins carry Brāhmī legends and all the copper coins carry legends in Kharoshthī. A representative sequence of the coin series is provided in the Appendix to this paper, where I also discuss in some detail how I arrived at the chronology I have proposed.

The coin legends are helpful in the creation of a relative chronology of the kings because they include a patronymic, thereby giving us the name of the king and his father.²⁹ Further, the early coins in silver have an unusual characteristic: each king re-used on his own first coin issues the last obverse dies used by his predecessor. This allows us to determine the exact order of succession even when multiple sons of the same father became

²⁵ The coins are of Datayola II, for whom coins with the name as *Pāratarāja* are standard, but for which I have now found some with the spelling *Pāradarāja*. Coin 31 in the Appendix is an example.

²⁶ Tandon 2006, Tandon 2009, and Tandon 2010.

²⁷ There are a very few rare small denomination coins that either leave off the swastika or even the bust for lack of space.

²⁸ There is one known coin with a Sanskrit legend.

²⁹ In this respect, as in some others, the coins resemble those of their contemporaries, the Western Kshatrapa kings, whose coins also feature a bust on the obverse and a reverse consisting of a central design element surrounded by a circular legend that included the name of the king and of his father. This similarity led some authors to conclude that the *Pāratarāja* coins must have been issued in an area close to the Western Kshatrapa realm, perhaps in Saurashtra. See, for example, Mitchiner 1976, pp. 821-822. Smith (1897) had associated the *Pāratas* with the *Pārādā* river in the Surat district, adding to this misidentification (see note 2 above).

king. Finally, the coins show a subtle evolution in design details that also served to determine the relative order of the kings. This evolution in design was also important in establishing that the silver and copper coins formed a sequence rather than parallel or disconnected series. As a result of all these features, I have reconstructed the list of Pārata kings in chronological order, with approximate dates, as follows:

1. Yolamira, son of Bagareva, c. 125-150
2. Bagamira, son of Yolamira, c. 150
3. Arjuna, son of Yolamira, c. 150-165
4. Hvaramira, son of Yolamira, c. 165-175
5. Mirahvara, son of Hvaramira, c. 175-185
6. Miratakhma, son of Hvaramira, c. 185-200
7. Kozana, son of Bagavharna, c. 200-220
8. Bhimarjuna, son of Yolatakhma, c. 220-230
9. Koziya, son of Kozana, c. 230-265
10. Datarvharna, son of Datayola I, c. 265-285
11. Datayola II, son of Datarvharna, c. 285-300

The dates here vary somewhat from the ones I suggested in my earlier papers; I have adjusted them slightly in light of additional work I have done on the number of coin types and coin dies for each king. But the dates still fit in the same overall time frame. It is important to remember that the dates are meant only as broad suggestions, since no specific information on any date or regnal length is available.

Since the coins themselves are not dated, it is worth laying out in outline how I arrived at the dates I have suggested. Many different factors were involved.

In his analysis of the potsherds from Tor Dherai, Konow commented on the use of the term *Shahi*, arguing that, although this term for king was originally “used by the old Sakas who founded an empire in the Indus country some time before the beginning of the Vikrama era[, i]t was revived by Kanishka.”³⁰ Since our best guess at the date of Kanishka is 127, we would date the first coins of Yolamira to a period around or after this date.

The metrology of the silver coins indicates a weight standard for the drachm at around 3.65 gm. This is a slightly odd weight that does not fit with any of the “standard” weights. However, the Parthian drachm, which started out in the third century BCE on the Attic standard, showed a steady decline in weight over time, and it fluctuated in the general area of 3.65 gm. during the first and second centuries.

³⁰ Konow, 1929, p. 175.

The use of patronymics on the Pāratārāja coins indicates a possible influence from the Western Kshatrapas, who also used patronymics and who in turn had been influenced by the use of matronymics on the coins of the Satavahanas. The first Western Kshatrapa ruler to use patronymics was Chastana, who is dated to the year c. 78. Thus the Pāratārāja coins probably were issued after this date.

There is a rare copper coin type of the Western Kshatrapa ruler Rudradāman (130-150) that features a bust very similar in style to those of the early Pāratārājas. In particular, the Rudradāman coin includes the shoulders in its representation of the king's bust, as do the Pāratārāja coins. This suggests a roughly similar date for the two coin types.

There are several paleographic features of the silver Pāratārāja coin legends that indicate they were inscribed during the second century.

In a detailed analysis of sixteen dynasties from the ancient world, I calculated that the average length of a royal generation at the time, and in that general geographic area, was approximately 25 years.³¹ Further, my analysis showed that the eleven Pāratārāja kings whose coins we know belonged to seven generations. This suggested that the overall time period covered by this coin series would be approximately 175 years, which led to the overall span for the known rulers of c. 125-300.

The last Pāratārāja king in the series was Datayola II and we have two coins of his that are overstrikes of the Kushano-Sasanian king Hormizd I. Since Cribb (1990) has dated Hormizd to c. 270-290, Datayola II must have ruled at around this time or shortly after. The dates of 285-300 in my series seem to fit this quite well.³²

The fixing of the dates for the first king, Yōlamira, to c. 125-150, and of the last king, Datayola II, to c. 285-300, along with the approximate 25-year span assigned per generation, yields an approximate date for Koziya of c. 230-265.³³ Now Koziya was the first king to issue coins featuring a standing king type, rather than just a bust (see coin 26 in the Appendix). This type became the standard type for the subsequent kings also. Koziya's standing king is shown wearing a knee-length tunic, very much like the tunics worn by the Kushan kings starting with Kanishka and extending to the end of the series. But Koziya's tunic shows a curved hem, rather than

³¹ See Tandon 2009, Appendix.

³² Grenet 2007, pp. 259-260, n. 16, has suggested a later date for Hormizd I, shifting "Cribb's chronology ... forwards by 20-30 years." With this correction, the dates for Datayola II would also shift forwards, perhaps to 300-325, and the entire Pāratārāja series could similarly be moved forwards, or could be stretched out to a slightly longer time span.

³³ I have estimated Koziya's reign as lasting 35 years despite the so-called 25-year per generation limit because he issued a much larger number of coin types than any other ruler. The Appendix illustrates the variety of coins issued by Koziya.

the straight hem featured on the coins of Kanishka I (c. 127-150) and Vasudeva I (c. 195-225). The first Kushan king to show a similar curved hem was Kanishka II (c. 227-247). This time frame fits perfectly with my estimate for the reign of Koziya (c. 230-265).

Thus, while there is no single piece of evidence that establishes a date for the Pāratarāja series, all these arguments, taken together, give us a high degree of confidence in the broad dating of the Pāratarāja kings.

If this broad dating is accepted, we can start to delve a little bit into Pārata history. Mukherjee had suggested that this tribe is none other than the Paraitakenoi of various Greek sources, a tribe closely related to the Medes and originating in the same area.³⁴ Chaumont has denied any such connection, saying “Il est douteux que les Paradéniens aient quelque chose à voir avec le peuple dravidien des Pārata.”³⁵ But her reasoning is based upon the faulty assumption that the Pāratas were a Dravidian tribe, living in the Surat area. We see clearly from their names that they were an Iranian people, and we now know their location was in north-east Balochistan. It seems, therefore, that Mukherjee’s suggestion was on the mark.

Early references, such as Herodotus, place the tribe in the Medean region, but later references³⁶ have them further and further east until finally Ptolemy places them in the interior of Gedrosia in the first century CE.³⁷ Strabo had mentioned them as being subject to the Parthians. Certainly the early silver coinage of the Pāratas most closely resembles early Parthian coins; the fabric of the coins, their shape, the weight standard and the overall design all point to a strong Parthian influence. Other than Arjuna (see Table of coins, 3) and Bhimarjuna (8), all the names are Iranian and several of the early kings’ names indicate the family must have been worshippers of Mithra, since the root word *mira* appears repeatedly in the kings’ names.

Despite these strong indications of a connection to Parthia, there are also indications of powerful Indian influences on the Pāratas. The language of the coin legends is Prakrit and the script used was either Brāhmī or Kharoshthī. Although Yolamira assumes the title *Shahi* on his dedicatory

³⁴ Mukherjee 1972, Chapter III, explored the literary references to the Pāratas. I have reviewed and summarized this exploration in Tandon 2006, pp. 201-203.

³⁵ Chaumont 1975, p. 137.

³⁶ The tribe is mentioned by Herodotus, Strabo, Arrian, Isidore of Charax, Pliny, Ptolemy and the author of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*. For details, see Mukherjee 1972 or Tandon 2006.

³⁷ The fact that the Pāratas migrated from northern Iran to eastern Balochistan suggests an alternative explanation for the irrigation works known as the *Pardān-damb* that I discussed earlier. Even if these are related to the Pāratas, which is by no means certain, they could reflect a sojourn for the tribe during their centuries-long migration, rather than a more permanent settlement.

inscription of Tor Dherai, the term used on the coins is *Raja*. The use of the swastika as what appears to be a dynastic emblem also suggests an Indian influence as do the use of patronymics. The Tor Dherai potsherds document Yolamira's patronage of a Buddhist *vihara*. Finally, two of the kings' names are Indian: Arjuna and Bhimarjuna. Perhaps Arjuna's mother was Indian and Bhimarjuna may have been Arjuna's grandson.

There are some signs of Kushan influence also on the Pāratas. The use of the term *Shahi* on Yolamira's Tor Dherai potsherds and the pose of the standing king, wearing a Kushan style tunic, in the late Pārata coinage do suggest some cultural exchange with the Kushans. The overstriking of Kushano-Sasanian coins by Datayola II are also evidence of some connection between the two kingdoms.

One surprise in the Pārata coinage is that it betrays no Sasanian influence whatsoever. Neither the fabric nor any of the design elements on the coins seem to have any similarity with Sasanian coinage. One might have expected some such influence to be felt, particularly during the reign of Shāpur I, who claimed Pāradān as one of the lands over which he ruled, but no such influence is visible.

Nevertheless, the Pārata coinage displays the features of what we might call today a buffer state, a small country positioned in between two or three larger powers and deriving influences from them. Given that the tribe had migrated through the Parthian kingdom over the previous centuries, it is likely that in the first century its primary influence was from Parthia, as Strabo had indicated for an earlier period.³⁸ It is perhaps not surprising then that it was only in the second century, when Parthia was engaged in almost incessant civil war, and the Indo-Parthian kingdom had also gone into decline, that the Pāratas were strong and independent enough to commence issuing their own coinage. Their rise may also be related to the burgeoning Roman trade in the first and second centuries. The Pāratas must have controlled the Bolan pass and thereby the overland route from the coast to Arachosia. They may also have controlled the production of some key exports. The Periplus mentions nard as one of the important exports from India to Rome and Arrian testifies that the plant grew abundantly in the valleys of Gedrosia.³⁹ And Gedrosia was also reputed to be a major source of bdellium,⁴⁰ another important Roman import.

³⁸ Strabo 1856, XV.

³⁹ Nard, or spikenard, is closely related to lavender and was used in Roman times as a base for perfumes and to scent bath water. Nard is also mentioned in *The Song of Solomon* and was the perfume used by Mary of Bethany to anoint the feet of Jesus Christ. Pliny devoted a whole chapter of his *Natural History* to nard, and revealed that it could command a price as high as 75 denarii per pound. See Pliny 1893, Book XII, Chapter 26. Arrian reported that nard grew abundantly in Gedrosia: "this desert

The rise of the Pāratas therefore can be attributed to the confluence of two forces. On the one hand, their erstwhile masters, the Parthians, were weakening and preoccupied with internal struggles, thereby freeing their vassal on the periphery to assert their independence. At the same time, there was a growing Roman trade, helped along by the discovery of the monsoon winds, in the first and second centuries. This brought greater economic activity and wealth to their Indian trading partners: the Western Kshatrapas, the Kushans and perhaps even the Pāratas.

Indeed, a similar argument could also explain the decline of the Pāratas. Using the coins as our yardstick, we see that the second and early third century clearly represented their apogee as their coins are all in silver. But with Bhimarjuna, c. 220-230, we see decline beginning to set in. The silver content of the coins rapidly diminishes until it is reduced to copper. The coinage of Koziya (c. 230-265), although relatively copious, is all in base metal. And the coinage dwindles considerably soon thereafter until it disappears by the end of the third century. Thus it appears that the Pārata economy suffered a decline starting around 225 CE. What might have caused this decline? It could be that the same forces that led to the Pāratas' rise in the second century may have acted in reverse in the third. As Rome began its steady decline, trade with India suffered, and this may well have been a factor in the decline of the Kushans also. To the extent that the Pārata economy depended upon this trade, it would likely have suffered as a result of the trade's decline. Further, Iran was once again politically resurgent with the Sasanian ascent to power. According to my dates, the end of Kozana's rule in Pāradān coincided with the rise of Ardashir I. This is also when the silver coinage of the Pāratas ceases. Since Shāpur I indicated in his ŠKZ inscription that he ruled over Pāradān, it is quite possible that he extracted tribute from the Pāratas. Coupled with the decline of the Roman trade with India, this could well account for the declining fortunes of the Pārata economy. The death blow for the Pārata kingdom may well have been administered by Shapur II during his eastern campaign in the fourth century.⁴¹

produces many odoriferous roots of nard, ... but much of it was trampled down by the army, and a sweet perfume was diffused far and wide over the land by the trampling; so great was the abundance of it." See Arrian 1884, Book 6, Chapter XXII.

⁴⁰ Bdelium was another plant product, an aromatic gum that was used as a perfume and for medicinal purposes. In discussing Gedrosia, the *Periplus* reports: "This country yields much, wheat, wine, rice and dates; but along the coast there is nothing but bdelium." See Schoff 1912, p. 37.

⁴¹ I am indebted to Frantz Grenet for suggesting this possibility.

Who were the Pārata rulers at the time of the Sasanian inscriptions? Although we do not have a precise date for Shāpur I's ŠKZ inscription, we know the Sasanian king ruled from 241 to 272. According to my chronology, Koziya's reign in Pāradān was c. 230-265. It is therefore quite likely that he was the king during the bulk of Shāpur I's reign.

Turning to the Paikuli inscription, we know that Narseh ruled during 293-302. Again according to my chronology, this coincided with the reign of Datayola II and, indeed, the Pārata coin series seems to come to an end right around this time.⁴²

Establishing the identity of the Pāradānshāh in Narseh's time helps to resolve a matter of some dispute relating to the Paikuli inscription. According to the translation of the inscription by Humbach and Skjærvø, Pāradān is mentioned as follows: "... and Bīrwān Spandwardān, and the King of Pāradān, and King Rāzgurd ..." However, Chaumont had interpreted this short passage as: "Bīrvān, fils de Spandōrat, roi de Pāradān."⁴³ In other words she thought that the name of the Pāradānshāh at the time was Bīrvān, and that he was the son of Spandōrat. But from the coins we now know that neither of the names Bīrvān or Spandōrat belongs to the Pārada tribe, and that in fact the name of the Pāradānshāh at the time was Datayola. Thus "Bīrwān Spandwardān" refers to some other king, as suggested in Humbach and Skjærvø's translation.

The coin sequence of the Pāratarājas sheds light also on the nature of the relationship between Shāpur and the outlying parts of his empire. Although Pāradān is clearly named by Shāpur in the ŠKZ inscription as one of the lands over which he ruled, the fact that the Pāratarājas issued an unbroken series of coins suggests that they were not under direct administrative control of the empire, but at best a vassal state with considerable independent sovereignty. I have looked carefully to see if there is any break in the continuity of the coin sequence and have not found any. The only break, as such, is the transition from silver to copper in the period c. 220-230, and which I have argued may be a reflection of the declining fortunes of the Pārata economy. In the appendix to the paper, I illustrate the detailed sequence of Pārata coins, emphasizing the slow but continual evolution of the designs. I believe this evolution points to a steady continuity in the sequence, free of any dramatic breaks such as might be occasioned by an external conquest. Further, it may be noted that the coins show no Sasanian influence in terms of the designs, fabric or denomination of the coins, even though Pāradān was being mentioned in the Sasanian

⁴² If the dates for Datayola II should be somewhat later (see note 32 above), his father Datarvārna would have been ruling during Narseh's reign.

⁴³ Chaumont 1975, p. 136.

lists. The only new coin type we see in this period, the standing king type introduced by Koziya and continued by his successors, seems to owe more to Kushan than to Sasanian inspiration. This stands in sharp contrast to the experience in Bactria. The Sasanian foray into the Kushanshahr resulted in an immediate, visible effect on the coinage. Ardashir, for example, introduced Sasanian style coins immediately into Bactria, displacing the Kushan coins known in the area.⁴⁴ Indeed, the coins might lead one to wonder if Shāpur did in fact rule over Pāradān in any real sense, or whether his claim in ŠKZ was an exaggeration. As far as the evidence from the Paikuli inscription goes, it is quite plausible that Narseh did not rule over Pāradān, so, if Shāpur did indeed hold some power over it, this may have been short-lived.

In this context, the fact that Pāradān is *not* mentioned in the inscription of Karder at Ka'ba-i Zardušt (KKZ or KNRm), or in any of his other inscriptions, assumes some significance. Although Kettenhofen has suggested the possibility that Pāradān may have been mentioned "in der großen Lücke zu Beginn von KNRm 36,"⁴⁵ this is by no means certain, and the fact remains that no actual mention of Pāradān has been found on any inscription of Karder. Since his inscriptions refer to the establishment of fire temples in different parts of the empire, and cover a period stretching from the time of Shāpur I to Bahrām II (r. 276-293), the absence of Pāradān from his province lists does suggest that the degree of imperial control there during this entire period was weak at best and possibly non-existent. Gignoux, in his consideration of this problem, suggested that the provinces from Shāpur's ŠKZ list that were not present in KKZ (Pārdān, Hindestān, Kušānšahr and Mazūn) "ont pu échapper plus ou moins à la domination sassanide vers la fin du 3ème siècle."⁴⁶ In light of the coin sequence, it is not unreasonable to ask in what sense Pāradān ever was in the empire, the evidence of ŠKZ notwithstanding.

EVIDENCE FROM CHINESE SOURCES AND THE IDENTITY OF PAIZHI/PAITE

It is possible that the Pāratas were also mentioned in some Chinese historical sources and, if so, this sheds some additional light on the dynasty and the extent of its kingdom. In the *Hou Hanshu* of Fan Ye, written in the fifth century but based upon the reports of General Ban Yong, presented to the Chinese emperor in 125 CE, the following passage from Chapter 88 bears on the state of Arachosia in the early second century:

⁴⁴ See Cribb 1990, types 14-18 (p. 186). Shāpur II, during his advance into the Kushanshahr, also introduced his own coinage.

⁴⁵ Kettenhofen 1995, p. 10, n. 52.

⁴⁶ Gignoux 1971, p. 92.

Section 8 – The Kingdom of Wuyishanli (Arachosia and Drangiana): Southwest of Pishan [modern Pishan or Guma], you pass through Wucha [Upper Hunza and the Taghdumbash Pamir]), cross over the ‘hanging passages’ [the *xuandu* in Hunza], cross Jibin (Kapisha and Gandhara) and, at the end of more than 60 days march, you arrive at the Kingdom of Wuyishanli [Arachosia and Drangiana]. [Wuyishanli] extends for several thousand *li*. Now its name has changed to Paizhi [or Paite in some accounts].⁴⁷

Note that Hulwesé (1979) has shown that Wuyishanli refers to Alexandria, the main city of Arachosia, as he reads it as: “o/uo-diek/iek-sǎn/sǎn-lia/lie, evidently a transliteration of Alexandria.” He then goes on in the same passage to provide additional evidence of the name change. In his translation of the section on Wu-i-shan-li in Chapter 96 of that text, Hulwesé says that “in HHSCC 78.9a ... it is stated that its name was changed to P’ai-ch’ih,” rendered as b’ɛr/b’ai-d’iəg/d’i or, in a Sung copy of the *San-kuo chih*, as b’ɛr/b’ai-d’ək/d’ek,⁴⁸ which seem quite close to pār(a)da.

This place is also mentioned in the *Weilue* of Yu Huan, written in the middle of the third century. In the “Xirongzhuan” or the chapter on the western peoples, the *Weilue* says:

Leaving there (Kashgar), and going west, you reach Dayuan (Ferghana), Anxi (Parthia), Tiaozhi (Characene and Susiana), and Wuyi (Arachosia and Drangiana – capital, Kandahar). Wuyi is also called Paizhi.⁴⁹

So clearly this new name “Paizhi” requires some explanation.

In his analysis, Hill says: “Paizhi may have been a transcription of some local name, but the reconstructed ancient pronunciations do not resemble any name found in other sources and none of the characters are commonly used to transcribe foreign sounds.”⁵⁰ He then comes to the following conclusion, based partly on his assertion that Alexander’s generals may have built an army cantonment in the Kandahar area:

It seems to me that the name should rather be considered literally. *Pai* ... can have the meaning of ‘platoon(s)’ or ‘shield,’ and *chi* ... means ‘to take in hand,’ ‘to govern,’ ‘maintain,’ or ‘guard with firmness.’ Paichi may well have been intended to represent a ‘Cantonment’ ... probably centred at the old citadel near modern Kandahar.⁵¹

⁴⁷ Hill 2010a, p. 21.

⁴⁸ Hulwesé 1979, p. 112, n. 250.

⁴⁹ Hill 2010b.

⁵⁰ Hill 2010a, p. 214.

⁵¹ Hill 2010a, p. 215.

Since we do not know conclusively how these two characters were intended to be pronounced, this argument is necessarily somewhat speculative. There is no doubt that Hill's work is of a very high quality and his conclusions deserve much consideration. On the face of it, his interpretation of the name Paizhi seems plausible. But it seems to me that Hill has ignored the fact that the name had *changed* to Paizhi; it had not always been called this. I would argue that it is unlikely that the name would be changed to one that commemorates an event that took place some 450 years earlier. Surely Alexander's shadow did not stretch quite that far! So, while Hill's argument may be quite plausible for why the area might have been called *Paizhi* in 300 BCE, it seems less convincing as an explanation for why the name of Arachosia *changed* from Wuyishanli to Paizhi around 125 CE.

A natural alternative is the possibility that the new name for Arachosia—Paizhi or Paite—was a reflection of the new power that was asserting itself in that area: the Pāratas. In his analysis, Hill had said “the reconstructed ancient pronunciations do not resemble any name found in other sources.” However, we now know of the existence of the Pāratas and the fact that they were the issuers of a major coin series in that general geographic area at that time. The time of General Ban Yong's presentation to the emperor on which the *Hou Hanshu* is based happens to be precisely the year, 125 CE, in which I have estimated that Yolamira's rule began. Indeed, this evidence from the *Hou Hanshu* could serve as a corroboration of my dating of Yolamira, which I had arrived at independently. This is a time when the power of the Pāratas was growing enough for them to commence issuing a silver coinage. Perhaps their prestige was great enough that people started naming for them the area in which they ruled: Pāradān or Pāratān,⁵² which I suggest could have been presented in Chinese as Paizhi or Paite. In a private exchange, Hill acknowledged that he could not reject this hypothesis. Thus we await more information to shed light on this issue.

Another possible mention of the Pāratas in Chinese sources is by Xuanzang. He mentions a place called Pi-to-shi-lo which has still not been adequately identified. This name certainly calls to mind the name Paizhi or Paite, and it appears to have been in the general area of the Pārata realm. According to Xuanzang:

... going north-east from the kingdom of Liingula, about 700 *li*, we come to the kingdom of Pi-to-shi-lo ...

... From this, going north-east about 300 *li*, we come to the kingdom of O-fan-ch'a

⁵² In the Parthian version of ŠKZ, the name of this place is spelled p'rtn (see Huyse 1999, p. 23).

... Going from this eastwards 700 *li* or so, we come to the country of Sin-tu ...
 ... From this, going east 900 *li* or so, crossing the river to its eastern bank, we
 come to Mu-lo-san-po-la ...⁵³

The text goes on to describe Mu-lo-san-po-la. There is a clear description of a large Sun Temple, which tells us that this city must be Multan, which is quite plausible on phonetic grounds as well. Thus the river that must be crossed to reach it should be the Indus and therefore Sin-tu must refer in some way to the province of Sind. No one has been able to identify O-fan-ch'a or Pi-to-shi-lo. I confess I do not have a suggestion for O-fan-ch'a, but I do want to raise the possibility that Pi-to-shi-lo might be the same as Pai-zhi or Paite and, by extension, might therefore refer to Pāradān. The distances and directions given by Xuanzang are difficult to interpret exactly, but Loralai and the Bolan Pass are indeed west and slightly south of Multan, so the location is plausibly consistent with Xuanzang's text.

What is the implication of this for our purpose? First, if these Chinese sources are indeed referring to Pāradān, they provide additional support to the suggestion that Pāradān was indeed located in the area of Gedrosia and southern Arachosia. Second, and perhaps more important, if the name for Arachosia was in fact changed from Wuyishanli to Paizhi as a sign of the power of the Pāratas, this would suggest that the extent of their kingdom was great rather than small. It would suggest that the Pāratas ruled an area not just around Loralai but extending to Kandahar and beyond, perhaps including much of southern Arachosia.

There is a further element supporting the idea that Pāradān may have included much of southern Arachosia. Mukherjee 1972 has pointed out that the word *pārada* means "mercury" in Sanskrit.⁵⁴ Mercury was an important ingredient in certain compounds in the ancient *Ayurveda* system of medicine. Mukherjee argued that the use of the word *pārada* to mean mercury must have derived from the fact that the Pārada people traded it. He based his argument on two pieces of evidence, apart from the congruence of the word and the tribal name. First, the word does not appear in the medical treatise of Charaka, composed at the time of Kanishka (c. 127-147 CE), but it does appear in the treatises of Nāgarjuna and Amarasimha, which were composed later. Thus the word *pārada* came to mean mercury some time after the date of Kanishka, which is the time when we now know the Pārada people were becoming more prosperous. Second, he quotes one G. Watts, whose *Dictionary of the Economic Products of India*,

⁵³ Beal 1911, pp. 151-152.

⁵⁴ See Mukherjee 1972, pp. 63-65.

published in 1891, reported that mercury was found in the Garmsel area of the Helmand river valley. This could well have been the source for the mercury traded by the Pāradas. If so, it implies that they controlled the Garmsel area, which is in south-western Arachosia.

CONCLUSION

We have clear evidence that there was a tribe that called themselves the Pāratas or, towards the end of the 3rd century, the Pāradas, who ruled in the area around the present town of Loralai during the second and third centuries. They issued a very coherent coin series over an estimated 175-year period during c. 125-300 CE. During the first 100 years of this time, the coinage was in silver, indicating a robust economy and a relatively stable political power. The last 75 years show signs of declining fortunes, with the last 25 years or so signalling a rapid decline into oblivion.

This tribe is almost certainly the same as the one called the Pāradās in many ancient Indian texts and is also the one that lived in the area called Pāradān in the ŠKZ and Paikuli inscriptions. By identifying this tribe and the dynasty that ruled it in the second and third centuries, we can finally get some closure on the questions that were raised about the identity of Pāradān after the discovery of the ŠKZ and Paikuli inscriptions.

Although we can be very confident about this identification and the locating of Pāradān in the area around Loralai, we can be less confident about what exactly was the extent of the kingdom. Anecdotal evidence suggests that their coins are found as far east as Zhob, as far north as Kandahar and as far west as the Pakistan-Iran border. Ptolemy indicated the existence of a town called Paradabathra even further east, on the banks of the river Indus. There is also a hint that they may have constructed irrigation works as far west as Panjgur. It is possible that they traded in mercury, and that their source was an area in south-western Arachosia. Chinese sources also hint at the possibility that they may have been a powerful kingdom with considerable sway in Arachosia. The fact that two late Pāratārāja coins are overstruck on Kushano-Sasanian coins suggests that the two realms were probably immediate neighbors. Their common border may well have been in Arachosia, between Kandahar and Kabul.⁵⁵

I conclude by presenting a map in which I outline the location of Pāradān during the second and third centuries (see Fig. 1). I believe that this kingdom may have varied in size over time as its fortunes, and the fortunes of its neighbors, waxed and waned. The map shows a core area that

⁵⁵ Another possibility is of a border somewhere in what are now the tribal areas of northwest Pakistan, somewhere between Zhob and Peshawar.

I believe was virtually certainly part of the Pārata realm, centered around Loralai. I have also outlined a larger area, parts or all of which might have been within Pāradān at one time or another: southern Arachosia including the Kandahar area and the Helmand river valley, the area around Panjgur, and an area stretching east towards the Indus river. There is suggestive evidence for each of these areas as possible parts of the Pārata kingdom, as outlined in the preceding discussion. The locations for Turān and Makurān are also indicated in the map. Whereas the location of Makurān is relatively non-controversial, the location of Turān is quite tentative. It could well extend further east towards Kalat to accommodate the evidence of the *Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam*, in which case the border with Pāradān would shift closer to the Quetta area. What most distinguishes this map from all the other maps I have seen is that it reverses the positions of Turān and Pāradān, placing Turān to the west and Pāradān to the east. This contrasts with the maps of Brunner, Chaumont, Gyselen, Kettenhofen and Huyse,⁵⁶ all of which had placed Pāradān to the west of Turān. The previous estimate that appears to have been closest to the correct one was that of Frye (1984).

More well-documented coin finds, and other archaeological discoveries, are needed for us to gain a more complete picture of the extent of this short-lived outlier kingdom, which appears to have carved out a niche for itself between powerful neighbors to the west (Parthians and Sasanians), the east (Western Kshatrapas) and the north (Kushans and Kushano-Sasanians). Nevertheless, I believe we can now have considerable confidence in at least the rough location of Pāradān, thereby resolving an uncertainty that has persisted for close to a century.

Pankaj TANDON
 Department of Economics
 Boston University
 270 Bay State Road
 Boston, MA 02215.
 USA
 <ptandon@bu.edu>

⁵⁶ See Brunner 1983, p. 749, Chaumont 1975, p. 132, Gyselen 1989, p. 87, Kettenhofen 1995, p. 173, and Huyse 1999, II, Tafel 2.



Fig. 1: Map of Pāradān (© P. Tandon)

APPENDIX

THE PĀRATARĀJA CHRONOLOGY

This appendix shows a representative sequence of coins for each Pārata king. The emphasis is on showing the evolution of the coinage as a way of justifying the particular chronology I have developed.

With the early kings, who issued coins in silver, the chronology is relatively straightforward as each king names his father and we have the natural chronology that emerges from that. Thus Bagamira, Arjuna and Hvaramira all name Yolamira as their father and so must have followed him, and Mirahvara and Miratakhma both name Hvaramira as their father and so must have followed him. To decide the order in which the brothers ruled, I made use of the fact that each king used his predecessor's last obverse die as his own first die. Thus Bagamira (coin 3) used Yolamira's last die (coin 2) on the only coins of his that are known (only two specimens are known). Arjuna (coin 4) also used this die, but later used a different die (coin 5) that was subsequently used by Hvaramira (coin 6), who did not share a die with his father. Thus we get a clear order for the three sons of Yolamira: Bagamira was first, followed by Arjuna, and then by Hvaramira. Similarly, to decide the order in which the brothers Mirahvara and Miratakhma ruled, we see that Mirahvara (coin 9) used the last die of his father Hvaramira (coin 8) and so must have directly followed him. Miratakhma does not share a die with his father. But he does share a die (coin 12) with one of his (presumably older) brother Mirahvara's later coins (coin 11).

Matters become more difficult with the remaining coins, as we do not have a continuous series of sons following fathers, nor have I found any obverse dies that were used by more than one king. Identifying the order of rulers is therefore not a straightforward matter. There is a greater, prior problem with these coins, almost all of which use Kharoshthī in the legends rather than the Brāhmī used by the first six kings. Because Kharoshthī had been replaced by Brāhmī in all the areas where it had been used, it was natural to expect and assume that the Kharoshthī legend coins must have preceded the Brāhmī legend coins, or at best have been contemporaneous with them. But I believe I have demonstrated convincingly that the Kharoshthī legend coins in fact follow the Brāhmī legend coins in a single sequence.

The analysis starts with Kozana. He is the only king from the Kharoshthī series to have issued only silver coins. All the coins of the first six kings, using Brāhmī legends, were in silver. Kozana issued one coin type (only one specimen is known) in which he used a Brāhmī legend (coin 15). All the rest of Kozana's coinage uses Kharoshthī, but is in silver. So in choice of metal and through the one Brāhmī issue, he can be linked to the other silver coins. There are two further links. First, Kozana issued double drachms (coin 17) that used the same obverse






die as the double drachms of Hvaramira (coin 7) and Mirahvara (coin 10), although Kozana's coin is at a lower weight, indicating it was issued later. I believe these double drachms were special issues and that the obverse die for them was actually made in Yolamira's time. Compare the obverses of the double drachms to Yolamira's original drachm die (coin 1) and the similarity of style is self-evident. Thus the double drachms are an important manifestation of continuity in the Pāratarāja series. Second, the entire silver series featured a bare-headed bust facing right, but the last king in the Brāhmī series, Miratakhma, issued a new style obverse featuring a left-facing bust crowned with a peaked tiara (coin 14). Kozana also issued coins with this feature (coins 18 and 19) and they became the standard form for subsequent issues. For all these reasons, it seems veritably certain that Kozana followed Miratakhma to the throne and the rest of the Kharoshthī coin sequence followed.






Who succeeded Kozana? Since we know of coins of Kozana's son Koziya, it would be natural to suppose that Koziya succeeded his father. However, I believe Kozana was succeeded by Bhimarjuna. There are two reasons why this is probably the case. First, Bhimarjuna's coins show a variation in metal content: there are some silvery coins, some quite base billon and some that appear to be copper. It seems natural to infer that it was his earliest coins that had a higher silver content, similar to Kozana's, but over time the silver content was reduced, presumably because the dynasty's fortunes were declining. All of Koziya's coinage is in copper, and therefore appears to have come later. Second, the style of Bhimarjuna's coins (coin 20) seems closer to that of Kozana's than does the style of Koziya's. Notably, the size of the head on Bhimarjuna's coinage is relatively small, like the head on Kozana's coins. All of Koziya's portrait style coins (coins 21-25) feature much larger heads. Thus I believe Kozana was succeeded by Bhimarjuna and Koziya followed him.






Finally, the succession after Koziya went to Datarvharna and then to his son Datayola II. These last two kings' main coinage consisted of a standing king type, a type introduced by Koziya (coins 26-28). We see the natural evolution of this type in the sequence. Koziya started with a right-facing king wearing a peaked tiara (coin 26). This was followed by a type in which the king still faced right but now wore a turban (coin 27, mirroring a similar change from tiara to turban in the lower denomination bust type, as seen in coins 21-25), and this in turn was followed by a left-facing type with a turban (coin 28). Datarvharna copied this type on all his coinage (coin 29). Datayola II also issued the same type with the same characteristics; the only change was that Datayola's coins feature a swastika turning left on the reverse, as compared to the right-turning swastika on all the previous standing king types (coin 30). One other small innovation on some of Datayola's coins is a change in the spelling of the dynastic name, from Pārata to Pārada (coin 31). Datayola II also issued a new type (coin 32): a tetradrachm featuring a bust left, but this has no successor that we know. These are the last coins that can definitively be attributed to the Pāratas.


TABLE OF COINS

Abbreviations: L =left Obv =obverse R =right Rev =reverse s/o =son of

No. and details	Photo	Design details and Legend
1. Yolamira s/o Bagareva (c. 125-150 CE)		
<i>Coin 1</i> Early silver drachm 3.56 gm, 16 mm		Obv: Bust R Rev: Swastika L, legend around: <i>@11h: Yolamirasa Bagarevapura Pāratarājasa</i>
<i>Coin 2</i> Late silver drachm 3.91 gm, 15-16 mm		Obv: Bust R Rev: Swastika R, legend around: <i>@7h: Yolamirasa Bagarevapura Pāratarājasa (retrograde!)</i>
2. Bagamira s/o Yolamira (c. 150 CE)		
<i>Coin 3</i> Silver drachm 3.66 gm, 15 mm		Obv: Bust R (same die as coin 2) Rev: Swastika R, legend around: <i>@12h: Bagamirasa Yolamiraputrasa Pāratarājasa</i>
3. Arjuna s/o Yolamira (c. 150-165 CE)		
<i>Coin 4</i> Early silver drachm 4.46 gm, 16 mm		Obv: Bust R (same die as coins 2-3) Rev: Swastika R, legend around: <i>@9h: Arjunasa Yolamiraputrasa Pāra (legend truncated)</i>
<i>Coin 5</i> Late silver drachm 3.55 gm, 17 mm		Obv: Bust R Rev: Swastika R, legend around: <i>@9h: Arjunasa Yolamiraputasa Pāratajasa (sic! ra missing)</i>

4. Hvaramira s/o Yolamira (c. 165-175 CE)		
<p><i>Coin 6</i> Early silver drachm 3.70 gm, 15 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust R (same die as coin 5) Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @12h: <i>Hvaramirasa Yolamira-putrasa Pārata</i> (rājasa missing)</p>
<p><i>Coin 7</i> Silver didrachm 7.53 gm, 20 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust R Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @9h: <i>Hvara(mirasa Yolamirapu)trasa Pāratarājasa</i></p>
<p><i>Coin 8</i> Late silver drachm 3.64 gm, 15-16 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust R Rev: Swastika L, legend around: @6h: <i>Hvaramirasa Yodamiraputrasa Pāratarājasa</i></p>
5. Mirahvara s/o Hvaramira (c. 175-185 CE)		
<p><i>Coin 9</i> Early silver drachm 3.57 gm, 15 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust R (same die as coin 8) Rev: Swastika L, legend around: @12h: <i>Mirahvarasa (H)va(ramiraputrasa) Pāratarāja</i> (no sa)</p>
<p><i>Coin 10</i> Silver didrachm 6.76 gm, 17 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust R (same die as coin 7) Rev: Swastika L, legend around: @10h: <i>Mirahvarasa Hvaramiraputrasa Pāratarājasa</i></p>

<p><i>Coin 11</i> Late silver drachm 3.08 gm, 15-16 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust R Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @11h: <i>Mirahvarasa</i> (H)varamiraputrasa <i>Pāratarājasa</i></p>
6. Miratakhma s/o Hvaramira (c. 185-200 CE)		
<p><i>Coin 12</i> Early silver drachm 3.39 gm, 14 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust R (same die as coin 11) Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @12h: <i>Miratakhmasa</i> <i>Hvaramiraputrasa Pāratarājasa</i></p>
<p><i>Coin 13</i> Late silver drachm 3.66 gm, 14 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust R Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @12h: <i>Miratakhmasa</i> <i>Hvaramiraputrasa Pāratarājasa</i></p>
<p><i>Coin 14</i> Late silver drachm 3.66 gm, 14 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust L wearing peaked tiara Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @12h: <i>Miratakhmasa</i> <i>Hvaramiraputrasa Pāratarājasa</i></p>
7. Kozana s/o Bagavharna (c. 200-220 CE)		
<p><i>Coin 15</i> Silver hemi- drachm 1.67 gm, 13 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust R Rev: Swastika R, Brāhmī legend around: @11h: <i>Kozanasa</i> (Bagavhar)naputrasa Pāratarājasa (sa missing)</p>

<p><i>Coin 16</i> Silver drachm 3.47 gm, 14-16 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust R Rev: Swastika R, Kharoshthī legend around: @4h: <i>Kozanasa</i> <i>Bagavharnaputrasa</i> <i>Pāratarāja</i></p>
<p><i>Coin 17</i> Silver didrachm 5.05 gm, 17 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust R (same die as coins 7, 10) Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @10h: <i>Kozanasa Bagavharna</i> <i>putrasa Pāratarā (jasa missing)</i></p>
<p><i>Coin 18</i> <i>Reduced</i> drachm 2.23 gm, 15 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust L wearing peaked tiara Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @10h: <i>Kozanasa Bagavharna-</i> <i>putrasa Pāratarāja (sa missing)</i></p>
<p><i>Coin 19</i> Hemi- drachm 1.04 gm, 11 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Crowned bust L in dotted border Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @10h: <i>Kozanasa Bagavharna-</i> <i>putrasa Pāratarāja</i></p>
8. Bhimarjuna, s/o Yolatakhma (c. 220-230 CE)		
<p><i>Coin 20</i> Billon drachm 2.09 gm, 15-16 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Crowned bust L in dotted border Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @12:30h: <i>Bhimarjunasa</i> <i>Yolatakhmaputrasa Pāratarāja</i></p>
9. Koziya, s/o Kozana (c. 230-265 CE)		
<p><i>Coin 21</i> Copper drachm 2.21 gm, 14-15 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Crowned bust L in dotted border Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @1h: <i>Koziyasa Kozanaputrasa</i> <i>Pāratarāja</i></p>

<p><i>Coin 22</i> Copper drachm 1.55 gm, 13 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Crowned bust L w/ ear flap Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @4h: <i>Koziyasa Kozanaputrasa</i> <i>Pāratarājasa</i></p>
<p><i>Coin 23</i> Copper drachm 1.76 gm, 13 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Crowned bust L, hair in rows Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @1h: <i>Koziyasa Kozanaputrasa</i> <i>Pāratarājasa</i></p>
<p><i>Coin 24</i> Copper drachm 1.54 gm, 12-13 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Crowned bust L, king with moustache Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @3h: <i>Koziyasa Kozanaputrasa</i> <i>Pāratarāja</i> (no sa)</p>
<p><i>Coin 25</i> Copper drachm 1.28 gm, 12-13 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Bust R wearing turban with flap Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @12h: <i>Koziyasa Kozanaputrasa</i> <i>Pāratarājasa</i></p>
<p><i>Coin 26</i> Copper didrachm 3.87 gm, 21 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Standing king R, wearing peaked tiara, inscription L: <i>Koziya</i> Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @3h: <i>Koziyasa Kozanaputrasa</i> <i>Pāratarājasa</i></p>
<p><i>Coin 27</i> Copper didrachm 3.94 gm, 19 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Standing king R, wearing turban, inscription L: <i>Koziya</i> Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @2h: <i>Koziyasa Kozanaputrasa</i> <i>Pāratarājasa</i></p>

<p><i>Coin 28</i> Copper didrachm 4.66 gm, 17-18 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Standing king L wearing turban, inscription R: <i>Koziya</i> Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @12:30h: <i>Koziyasa Kozana-putrasa Pāratarāja</i></p>
<p>10. Datarvharna, s/o Datayola (c. 265-285 CE)</p>		
<p><i>Coin 29</i> Copper didrachm 3.40 gm, 17 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Standing king L, hair in turban Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @2h: <i>Datarvhnasa Datayola-putrasa Pāratarāja</i></p>
<p>11. Datayola II, s/o Datarvharna (c. 285-300 CE)</p>		
<p><i>Coin 30</i> Copper didrachm 4.66 gm, 17-18 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Standing king L, hair in turban Rev: Swastika L, legend around: @3h: <i>Datayolasa Datarvhnasa-putrasa Pāratarāja</i></p>
<p><i>Coin 31</i> Copper didrachm 4.11 gm, 16-18 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Standing king L, hair in turban Rev: Swastika L, legend around: @2:30h: <i>Datayolasa Datarvhnasa-putrasa Pāratarāja</i></p>
<p><i>Coin 32</i> Copper 4-drachm 7.72 gm, 21 mm</p>		<p>Obv: Diademed bust L holding flower Rev: Swastika R, legend around: @11h: <i>Datayolasa Datarvhnasa-putrasa Pāratarāja</i></p>

Photos not to scale; size given in the left column.

Coin 3: © Courtesy of Anne van't Haaf. Coin 15: © Courtesy of R. C. Senior.

Coin 27: © Courtesy of Wilfried Pieper. All other coins collection of the author.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arrian 1884: Arrian, *The Anabasis of Alexander* (E.J. Chinnock translator), Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1884.
- Beal 1911: Beal, Samuel, *The Life of Hiuen Tsiang*, Kegan Paul, London, 1911.
- Brunner 1983: Brunner, Christopher, "Geographical and Administrative Divisions: Settlements and Economy," in: *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Volume III/2 (Ehsan Yarshater, ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1983, pp. 747-777.
- Chaumont 1975: Chaumont, Marie-Louise, "États vassaux dans l'Empire des premiers Sassanides," in: *Monumentum H. S. Nyberg*, vol. I (Acta Iranica, 4), 1975, pp. 89-156.
- Cribb 1990: Cribb, Joe, "Numismatic Evidence for Kushano-Sasanian Chronology," *Studia Iranica* 19 (1990), pp. 151-193.
- Falk 2007: Falk, Harry, "The Names of the Pāratārājas Issuing Coins with Kharoshthī Legends," *The Numismatic Chronicle* 167 (2007), pp. 171-178.
- Frye 1963: Frye, Richard N., *The Heritage of Persia*, World Publishing Company, Cleveland, 1963.
- 1984: Frye, Richard N., *The History of Ancient Iran*, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Munich, 1984.
- Gignoux 1971: Gignoux, Ph., "La Liste des Provinces de l'Ērān dans les inscriptions de Šābuhr et de Kirdīr," *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 19 (1971), pp. 83-94.
- Grenet 2007: Grenet, Frantz, "The Sasanian relief at Rag-i Bibi (Northern Afghanistan), III : Iconographic and historical comments," in: Joe Cribb and Georgina Herrman (eds.), *After Alexander: Central Asia before Islam*, Proceedings of the British Academy 133, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007, pp. 257-261.
- Gyselen 1989 : Gyselen, Rika, *La géographie administrative de l'Empire sassanide*, Groupe Pour l'Etude de la Civilisation du Moyen-Orient, Paris, 1989.
- Herzfeld 1924: Herzfeld, Ernst, *Paikuli. Monument and Inscription of the Early History of the Sasanian Empire*, 2 vols., Dietrich Reimer, Berlin, 1924.
- Hill 2010a: Hill, John, "Through the Jade Gate to Rome," booksurge.com (an Amazon company), Lexington, 2010.
- 2010b: Hill, John, "The Peoples of the West from the Weilüe by Yu Huan: A Third Century Chinese Account Composed between 239 and 265 CE." Draft annotated English translation, available online at: <http://depts.washington.edu/silkroad/texts/weilue/weilue.html>, accessed April 21, 2010.
- Holt 2005: Holt, Frank L., *Into the Land of Bones: Alexander the Great in Afghanistan*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 2005.
- Hulwesé 1979: Hulwesé, A. F. P., *China in Central Asia*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1979.
- Humbach and Skjærvø 1983: Humbach, Helmut, and Prods O. Skjærvø, *The Sasanian Inscription of Paikuli*, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1983.

- Huyse 1999: Huyse, Philip, *Die dreisprachige Inschrift Šābuhrs I. an der Ka'ba-i Zardušt (ŠKZ)*, 2 volumes, *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum*, Part III. Pahlavi Inscriptions, Vol. I. Royal Inscriptions, Texts I, School of Oriental and African Studies, London, 1999.
- Kettenhofen 1995: Kettenhofen, Erich, *Tirdād und die Inschrift von Paikuli*, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1995.
- Konow 1929: Konow, Sten, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. II pt. I: Archaeological Survey of India, Calcutta, 1929.
- Minorsky 1970: Minorsky, V. (translator), *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam*, ‘*The Regions of the World*.’ *A Persian Geography, 372 A.H.-982 A.D.*, Luzac & Company, London, 1970 [reprint].
- Mitchiner 1976: Mitchiner, Michael, *Indo-Greek and Indo-Scythian Coinage*, Volume 9: *Greeks, Sakas and their contemporaries in Central and Southern India*, Hawkins Publications, London, 1976.
- Mukherjee 1972: Mukherjee, B. N., *The Pāradās: A Study in their Coinage and History*, A. Mukherjee & Co., Calcutta, 1972.
- Pliny 1893: Pliny the Elder, *The Natural History*, transl. John Bostock and H. T. Riley, George Bell & Sons, London, 1893.
- Schoff 1912: Schoff, W. H. (translator and editor), *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea: Travel and Trade in the Indian Ocean by a Merchant of the First Century*, Longmans, New York, 1912.
- Smith 1897: Smith, V. A., “Conquests of Samudra-Gupta,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (October 1897), pp. 859-910.
- Stein 1931: Stein, Sir Aurel, *An Archaeological Tour to Gedrosia*, Calcutta, 1931; reprint: Cosmo Publications, 1982.
- Strabo 1856: Strabo, *The Geography*, transl. H. C. Hamilton and W. Falconer, Henry G. Bohn, London, 1856.
- Tandon 2006: Tandon, Pankaj, “New Light on the Pāratarājas,” *The Numismatic Chronicle* 166 (2006), pp. 173-209.
- 2009: Tandon, Pankaj, “Further Light on the Pāratarājas,” *The Numismatic Chronicle* 169 (2009), pp. 137-171.
- 2010: Tandon, Pankaj, “The Coins of the Pāratarājas: A Synthesis,” *Journal of the Oriental Numismatic Society*, Supplement to 205 (Autumn 2010), pp. 15-31.